

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-73 are cancelled, claims 74-118 are submitted as amended herein, and claims 119-136 are added. Accordingly, claims 74-136 are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Claims 75-81, 83, 85-86, 90-96, 98, 100-101, 105-111 and 113 have been amended solely to provide proper antecedence and to have the claims better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. None of these amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any of these claims, and no new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the Office Action, the Examiner requested corrected drawing sheets that incorporate the changes described in the Request to Amend Drawings dated June 18, 2003. Such replacement sheets are submitted with the present amendment.

The Examiner also requested the submission of a substitute specification with markings showing the changes made to the originally filed application as well as a clean version of the substitute specification and requested that the substitute specification be filed as such and "not in the form of an Amendment". Accordingly, the originally filed specification is cancelled and a substitute specification is submitted in place thereof. No new matter has been added by the substitute specification.

Turning to the art rejections, the Examiner rejected claims 74-118 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hishida (U.S. Patent No. 6,477,549). It is submitted, however, that the claims are patentably distinguishable over Hishida.

The Hishida patent is concerned with the editing of an HTML document that is initially suitable for display only by a personal computer or workstation into a form that is suitable

for display by pagers and/or mobile telephones. Hishida describes a document processing system that forms a transmission document by generating style sheets for each type of device that is to receive the transmission document and then incorporating the style sheets into the body of the HTML document. Each of the style sheets is written in a markup language and includes input and output information about a specific device type. When the transmission document is transmitted to a pager or mobile telephone, the receiving device extracts the particular style sheet written for that device and the document body from the transmission document and stores the document body and the style sheet in respective storage units. The first tag of each style sheet indicates the type of device for which it is intended, and the pager or mobile telephone determines the appropriate style sheet by reading the tags in the transmission document and when the tag is a "device" tag, judging whether the "device tag" is the tag for that device. The pager or mobile telephone then reads and analyzes the document body as well as the input and output information of the style sheet and then creates and outputs display data. (See Figs. 3, 6, 7, 9, and 17-18; col. 2, lines 10-17 and 39-63; col. 9, lines 10-35 and 50-63; col. 10, lines 30-54; col. 11, lines 19-37; col. 12, lines 37-50; col. 16, line 40 - col. 17, line 10; and col. 17, line 51 - col. 18, line 30).

Hishida therefore describes the transmitting of documents intended for display on a pager or mobile telephone, and Hishida describes that style sheets and a document body are extracted from the received transmission document. The patent does not disclose or suggest decoding digital broadcast signals into AV data that includes visual and audio information and into data that is supplementary to the AV data. Hishida does not suggest:

decoding the digital broadcast signals into AV data that includes visual and audio information and into supplementary data that includes content data having content attributes

as defined in claim 74.

Hishida also describes that the receiving device determines the appropriate style sheet based solely on *reading the first tag in the style sheet*. The receiving device does not base this determination on other information such as the *output information* contained in the style sheet and thus does not base the determination on *output attributes*. (See Fig. 9 and col. 12, lines 39-53.) Thus, the reference does not disclose or suggest obtaining a style sheet based on *output attributes of an output device* and does not disclose or suggest obtaining a style sheet based on *content attributes* of content data. Hishida therefore does not suggest:

obtaining a style sheet based on attributes selected from the group consisting of the output attributes and the content attributes, the style sheet including output format information

as called for in claim 74.

It follows that Hishida does not disclose or suggest the method defined in claim 74 and that the claim is patentably distinct and unobvious over Hishida.

Claims 75-83 depend from claim 74, and each further defines and limits the invention set out in the independent claim. It follows that each of claims 75-83 is patentably distinguishable over Hishida at least for the same reasons.

Further regarding claim 82, Hishida describes extracting a style sheet from *the received transmission document* and does not disclose or suggest obtaining the style sheet *from a remotely located server* via a network.

As to independent claim 84, Hishida describes a transmission document editing device that incorporates style

sheets into a document body to form a transmission document that is to be transmitted to a pager or a mobile phone, namely, the transmission document includes both *the document body and the style sheets of the intended devices*. The patent does not disclose or suggest a request for a style sheet and does not disclose or suggest *receiving the request from a remotely located device*. Moreover, Hishida does not disclose or suggest that such a request includes a file name, at least one output attribute, or at least one content attribute. Hishida does not suggest:

receiving, at the server, a request for at least one of said plurality of style sheets, the request being sent from a remotely located device via a network and including information selected from the group consisting of a file name, at least one output attribute, and at least one content attribute

as set out in claim 84.

Moreover, because Hishida does not suggest receiving a request, the patent does not disclose or suggest selecting a style sheet *as a function of the information of the request*. Hishida therefore does not suggest:

selecting, at the server, the at least one of the plurality of style sheets as a function of the information of the request

as recited in claim 84.

It follows that Hishida neither discloses or suggests the method called for in claim 84, and claim 84 is patentably distinct and unobvious over the reference.

Claims 85 and 86 depend from claim 84 and are patentably distinguishable over Hishida at least for the same reasons.

Independent claim 87 defines a method of delivering broadcast content that includes limitations similar to those set

out in claim 74, and therefore claim 87 is patentably distinct and unobvious over Hishida for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 88 recites a method of processing broadcast content that includes limitations similar to those recited in claims 74 and 84. Claim 88 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over Hishida at least for the same reasons.

Independent claim 89 defines an apparatus for processing broadcast content and calls for:

a decoder operable to decode the digital broadcast signals into AV data that includes visual and audio information and into supplementary data that includes content data having content attributes

and further calls for:

a selecting section operable to obtain a style sheet based on attributes selected from the group consisting of the output attributes and the content attributes, the style sheet including output format information [.]

For at least for the same reasons described above regarding claim 74, claim 89 is patentably distinct and unobvious over the Hishida patent.

Claims 90-98 depend from claim 89, and each is patentably distinguishable over Hishida for at least the same reasons. Moreover, claim 97 includes limitations similar to those set out in claim 82 and is further distinguishable over the cited reference for at least for the same reasons.

Independent claim 99 is directed to a style sheet server that includes:

a receiving section operable to receive a request for at least one of the plurality of style sheets, the request being sent from a remotely located device via the network and including information selected from the group consisting of a file name, at least one output attribute, and at least one content attribute

and further calls for:

a selecting section operable to select the at least one of the plurality of style sheets as a function of the information of the request [.]

Claim 99 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over Hishida for at least the reasons described above regarding claim 84.

Claims 100 and 101 depend from claim 99 and are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 102 defines a system for delivering broadcast content and includes a decoder and a selecting section of a receiving station that are similar to those defined in claim 89. Therefore, claim 102 is patentably distinct and unobvious over Hishida for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 103 relates to a system for processing broadcast content and includes a receiving station similar to that defined in claim 89 and a style sheet server similar to that defined in claim 99. It follows that claim 103 is patentably distinct and unobvious over Hishida for at least for the same reasons.

Independent claim 104 defines a recordable medium recorded with instructions for carrying out the method of claim 74. Therefore, claim 104 is patentably distinct and unobvious over the cited reference for at least the same reasons.

Claims 106-113 depend from claim 104, and each is patentably distinguishable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons. Moreover, claim 112 includes limitations similar to those set out in claim 82 and is further distinguishable over the reference for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 114 defines a recordable medium recorded with instructions for carrying out the method of claim

84. Claim 114 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the Hishida patent for at least the same reasons.

Claims 115 and 116 depend from claim 114 and are distinguishable over the cited reference at least for the same reasons.

Independent claim 117 recites a recordable medium recorded with instructions for carrying out the method of claim 87. It follows that claim 117 is patentably distinguishable over Hishida for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 118 is concerned with a recordable medium recorded with instructions for carrying out the method of claim 88. Claim 118 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the Hishida patent at least for the same reasons.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested:

New claims 119 and 120 depend from claim 74, new claims 121 and 122 depend from claim 87, and new claims 123 and 124 depend from claim 88, new claims 125 and 126 depend from claim 89, new claims 127 and 128 depend from claim 102, new claims 129 and 130 depend from claim 103, new claims 131 and 132 depend from claim 104, new claims 133 and 134 depend from claim 117, and new claims 135 and 136 depend from claim 118. Therefore, each of the claims is patentably distinguishable over the Hishida patent for at least the same reasons. Further, Hishida does not disclose or suggest at least one data module *that is periodically repeated* in the content data as called for in new claims 120, 122, 124, 126, 128, 130, 132, 134, and 136.

Support for new claims 119, 121, 123, 125, 127, 129, 131, 133, and 135 is found, e.g., in Figs. 6 and 7 and in paragraphs [0128]-[0129] and [0149] of the specification. Support for new claims 120, 122, 124, 126, 128, 130, 132, 134, and 136 is found, e.g., in Fig. 3 and in paragraphs [0098] and [0164] of the specification.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: February 4, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant



**IN THE DRAWINGS**

As requested by the Examiner, replacement drawing sheets are submitted with the present Amendment and include the changes set out in the June 18, 2003 Request to Amend Drawings.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets